

REMARKS

Claim 6, following entry of this Amendment, is the only claim pending in this application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 4 and 5 have now been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Andric et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,449,200) (hereinafter "Andric").¹ Applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

The subject application discloses fabric material that is widely used for a care label (or quality label) on clothing. A pattern printed with fluorescent pigment ink cannot be observed from a top view or bottom view under direct sunlight. The pattern only becomes visible when the top/bottom of the care label is irradiated with ultraviolet rays. Thus, a forger is not aware of the "hidden" print pattern. Further, the fabric material provides an effective and easy distinction between genuine and forged goods. Both sides of the fabric material comprise coating layers, which are suitable for normal printing (e.g., offset, dot matrix, thermal transfer and laser printing), and branded logo marks, characters, names, images, etc. may be printed with high quality. Moreover, the fabric material is strong, durable, and withstands repetitive washing and dry cleaning.

¹ Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled, and thus, the rejection of these claims is moot.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Andric discloses a security paper with a color mark comprising a resinous substrate sheet 14 and paper sheets 12, 16. [The security paper is not durable and does not withstand repetitive washing and dry cleaning.] The security paper of Andric is not analogous to Applicant's "fabric material," which can be used as a care label. Further, the substrate sheet of Andric is not analogous to Applicant's "woven or non-woven fabric base," and the top and bottom layers of Andric are not analogous to Applicant's "coating layer," as now recited in claim 6. *any non-in*
lack
app

Further, the opacity of the paper sheets 12, 16 of Andric is preferably at least 75% or 75-85% (col. 8, lines 1-4). In contrast, the opacity range of the top and bottom coating layers 11, 13 (Fig. 4) of the present invention is 20% to 92%. See, e.g., page 6, line 6-page 8, line 7, and Tables I and II. If the opacity of the sheets of Andric was less than 20%, then the print pattern formed on the fabric base 12 would be recognized when the fabric material is exposed to sunlight. This is contrary to the teachings of claim 6. If the opacity of the sheets of Andric exceeds 92%, then the print pattern could not be seen even with ultraviolet rays. This too is contrary to the teachings of claim 6.

Andric discloses fluorescent ink for printing indicia 18 (col. 9, lines 52-55). However, "[w]here ultraviolet inks are used to form part of the substrate indicia 18, indicia printed with such ink may be substantially undetectable under normal conditions, but visible under ultraviolet light." See column 9, lines 55-59. Although this is similar to how the print pattern should appear in the present invention, Andric fails to teach or suggest a specific means for achieving such visibility function.

does not have to

The text at column 8, lines 1-4, as identified by the Patent Office in the Office Action as teaching the opacity requirement, contradicts the above visibility function.

Based on the foregoing, Andric does not teach each and every feature of the invention as set forth in independent claim 6, and thus, claim 6 is submitted to be distinguishable over the Andric reference. Accordingly, claim 6 should be allowed.

Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Monica S. Davis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,492
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.
1425 K Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 783-6040
Facsimile: (202) 783-6031

July 10, 2003

I:\DATA\Clients\2583\2583-107.am3.wpd